

Specialized Professional Association (SPA) Success Stories

Dawn R. Johnson-Tate, MBA, MA, MS

Accreditation Coordinator

Bowie State University

March 2017

Bowie State University College of Education

- Center for Assessment, Accreditation, and Retention
- Last reaccreditation visit Spring 2012
- 8 Programs reviewed through the SPA process
- Program signature assessment review process enhanced Spring 2013
- *iSuccess* Assessment System updated Spring 2013
- All programs assessments reviewed and aligned to new standards Fall 2016
- Program data reviews - fall and spring semesters

Benefits of the Program Review Process

- External professional reviewing program outcomes and standards alignment to assessments
- Provides feedback on strengths of assessments
- Helps EPP to identify short-term and long-term program goals

Bowie's Program Changes from Program Review Process

- Identified areas of improvement on assessments
- Re-evaluate the assessments identified in the *Program Master Plan* for each program
- Identify and integrate common assessments between programs
- Collectively identify improvements in measuring student outcomes and alignment to program standards

Program Master Plan – Reading Education

Prepare For Life

MASTER OF EDUCATION – READING EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF TLPD, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION

STANDARDS: INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION (IRA) 2010

	Transition 1: Admission	Transition 2: Core/ Foundations	Transition 3: Advancement to Candidacy	Transition 4: Program Exit
Transition Criteria ▪ Direct Assessment ▪ Field/ Performance- Based Evaluation ▪ Indirect Assessment	▪ OVERALL GPA/ GRE REQUIREMENT* GPA, 2.5 Current teaching certificate Evidence of graduation from an accredited institution, BS degree in Education Completion of "Proposed Course of Study"	▪ UNIT/PROGRAM ENTRANCE SURVEY* (Conceptual Framework, Dispositions, Diversity & Technology)	▪ OVERALL GPA REQUIREMENT* ▪ COMPREHENSIVE EXAM* ▪ PRACTICUM EVALUATION* GPA 3.25 Comprehensive Examination Practicum Evaluation	▪ UNIT/PROGRAM EXIT SURVEY* (Conceptual Framework, Dispositions, Diversity & Technology) ▪ OVERALL GPA REQUIREMENT*
Program of Study				
Signature Assignment/ Professional Standards (IRA)				
1	Licensure or Other Content- Based Assessment	Teaching License current and issued for any level of school, K-12.	Course: EDUC 799 SA: <u>Comprehensive Exam</u> Standards: 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 3.1, 4.1, 5.1, 6.1, 6.2. Outcomes: Show mastery of content/practices in Reading Education	
2	Content -Based Assessment in reading education	Course: EDUC 545 : Reading in Content Areas SA: <u>Inquiry Project</u> Standards: 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.3, 3.1, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 6.1, 6.3 Outcomes: Measurement of content and application of content knowledge in classroom settings.		
3	Ability to plan Instruction			Course: EDUC 749 Practicum in Reading SA: <u>Lesson Plan</u> Standards: 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3. Outcomes: Measure knowledge and skills in development, implementing, executing, analyzing, collaboration, and professional reflection of a lesson plan

Program Master Plan – Reading Education (Cont.)

MASTER OF EDUCATION – READING EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF TLPD, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION STANDARDS: INTERNATIONAL READING ASSOCIATION (IRA) 2010

Signature Assignment		Transition 1	Transition 2	Transition 3	Transition 4
4	Assessment of Internship, Practicum, or other Clinical Practice			<p>Course: EDUC 633: Literature for Children SA: <u>Literate Environment Design</u> Standards: 1.0, 2.0, 2.2, 2.3, 3.0, 3.2, 3.3, 4.0, 5.0 Outcomes: Identify various textual and non-textual types of literature for children; Explains various genres of literature</p>	<p>Course: EDUC 749 Practicum in Reading SA: <u>Site Supervisor Evaluation</u> Standards: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.1, 5.3, 6.1, 6.2, 6.4 Outcomes: abilities to cause and improve learning of students who are experiencing problems in the various developmental phases of reading, writing, and other language arts abilities through coaching</p>
5	Assessment of candidate effect on student learning Or The ability to create supportive learning environments			<p>Course: EDUC 653: Reading: Multicultural Populations SA: <u>Reflective Teaching Portfolio</u> Standards: 4.0, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.2, 6.2, 6.3, 1.3, 2.2 Outcomes: Explains various types of diversity; Describes strategies for meeting needs of all students</p>	<p>Course: EDUC 749 Practicum in Reading SA: <u>Case Study</u> Standards: 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5.2, 5.4, 6.3 Outcomes: Improve reading instruction, gain a better understanding of teaching and learning process when teaching reading, and improve student achievement in reading.</p>
6	Assessment that addresses IRA standards				<p>Course: EDUC 751: Seminar in Reading SA: <u>Seminar Paper</u> Standards: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.1, 6.1 Outcomes: Show mastery of basic research reporting applied to a chosen area of reading or reading education</p>
7	Additional Assessment			<p>Course: EDUC 647: Contemporary Issues in Reading/Reading Education SA: <u>Issues Portfolio</u> Standards: 1.1, 1.4, 2.2, 2.3, 5.3, 3.1, 3.2, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4. Outcomes: Shows knowledge of various important issues in literacy and literacy education.</p>	<p>Course: EDUC 751: Seminar in Reading SA: <u>Electronic Professional Portfolio</u> Standards: 2.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3 Outcomes: Documentation of professional qualifications and experiences and of practicum experiences</p>
8	Additional Assessment				<p>Course: EDUC 749 Practicum in Reading SA: <u>Action Plan for Implementation of Professional Development Activities</u> Standards: 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.2, 5.4, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4. Outcomes: ability to create and implement a complete series of professional development plans and activities as a portion of their practicum experiences.</p>

Step by Step Rubric/Survey Development Process

- Two to three month rubric development process:
 - First meeting: Discuss current rubric, student learning outcomes, standards alignment, and areas for improvement based on data and program goals
 - Second meeting: Review first draft of the new rubric; make suggestions on narrative and measurements
 - Third meeting: Review second draft of rubric, suggest any additional changes
 - New and updated rubrics updated in iSuccess Assessment System - Fall semester only

Reading Education Sample Rubric Alignment

Site Supervisor Rubric – Master of Education Reading Education

IRA 2010 Standards: 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2, 3.3, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 5.2, 5.4, 6.1, 6.3, and 6.4

Description of Assessed Area	Unacceptable (1)	Needs Improvement (2)	Meets Standards (3)	Exceeds Standards(4)	Score/Level
Knows how to teach Basic reading skills IRA Elements 1.1, 1.2, 1.3.2.2, 2.3	Presents no evidence related to participation in the assessed area -Does not identify nor describe important elements in the processes and content of literacy development - Lacks evidence of knowledge of important literature and research in the field -Contributions to the development of the learning environment are minimal	-Shows little knowledge of the scholarship of the profession -Shows little support for ideas expressed -Identifies but does not explain various aspects of the literacy processes and content -Does not explain why certain strategies are useful -Plans for instruction lack attention to important elements of literacy development	-Critically analyzes the scholarship of the profession -Leads professional development activities -Discusses major theories of literacy processes and components -Offers supporting evidence of theories discussed -Uses strategies to meet needs of all learners in classroom group -Shows fairness in work with students and professionals -Plans for instruction show attention to most important elements in processes and content of literacy development	-Critically analyzes the scholarship of the profession -Reads literature and research about factors related to literacy development -Creates and presents professional development activities -Makes a point of focusing on Common –Core standards -Creates supportive classroom routines -Shows fairness in work with students and professionals Plans for instruction are complete with regard to essential details	
Understands the Reading process 2.3, 3.2, 3.3,	Plans do not reflect depth and breadth of understanding related to aspects of the process of learning to read Plans ignore individual differences	-Uses instructional strategies but does not identify supporting research _Lacks appropriate attention to individual differences _Fails to place balanced emphasis on relationships among all the language arts	Uses instructional strategies that are supported by research/best practices. Adapts strategies to meet need of students in classroom groups -Uses a balanced literacy approach to instruction	Shows relationships between strategies used and their supporting research bases. - Identifies significant leaders in the history of literacy development Curriculum shows balance among aspects of literacy	
Understands the Learner's	Candidate is unfamiliar with various developmental	Implements procedures to meet developmental	-Recognizes differences in wide range of categories	Leads teachers, other professionals , paraprofessionals	

Challenges to the Program Review Process

- Multiple reviewers during cycle result in inconsistent feedback
- Turn around time to collect and analyze data
- Training and updating new faculty on SPA report process

Contact Information

- ***Dawn R. Johnson-Tate, MBA, MS, MA***
- Accreditation Coordinator
- Center for Assessment, Accreditation and Retention, CLT Room 234
- Bowie State University
- 14000 Jericho Park Road, Bowie, MD 20715-9465
- 301-860-3224
- djohnson-tate@bowiestate.edu